

AMBASSADOR'S TEXTUAL POSITION

November 14, 1996 (David Cloud, Fundamental Baptist Information Service, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061, 866-295-4143, fbns@wayoflife.org; for instructions about subscribing and unsubscribing or changing addresses, see the information paragraph at the end of the article) -

The following article by Dr. James Quorllo is from The Ambassador, a publication of Ambassador Baptist College, 900 South Post Rd., Shelby, NC 28152. This illustrates the position of one of the schools which stands for the preserved Word of God today --

It comes as no surprise to anyone that there is a battle raging in fundamentalism regarding the modern versions or the text of the New Testament. We receive many inquiries regarding the textual position of Ambassador Baptist College, and the purpose of this article is to provide a brief answer to this question.

We believe that the Bible is comprised of the sixty-six books of the Old and New Testaments and that it was given in the original writings by inspiration of God. We believe, therefore, that the original manuscripts were both inerrant and infallible. They did not contain any error, and they were incapable of error because God the Holy Spirit superintended their writing.

While God dictated some portions of the Scriptures, we do not believe that God gave the Scriptures as a whole by the process of dictation. We believe that God the Holy Spirit guided the writers in the process of their writing with the result that we have the very words which God the Holy Spirit intended for us to have.

We furthermore believe in both verbal and plenary inspiration. The words themselves were inspired of God, even down to the smallest letter or even to a portion of a letter. In addition, we believe that all of the Scripture is inspired of God and that it is equally inspired throughout. There are no portions of Scripture which are more inspired than other portions, and there are no portions of Scripture which are less inspired than other portions.

We believe that God has preserved His word as He promised. We believe that the original manuscripts are best represented by the traditional texts; i.e., the Hebrew Masoretic text in the Old Testament and the set of manuscripts known as the Textus Receptus in the New Testament. While we recognize that there are a few difficulties in the text, we believe that the manuscripts known as the Textus Receptus are closer to the original than are the manuscripts of the Westcott and Hort tradition. Thus, we use the Greek New Testament as produced by the Trinitarian Bible Society in all of our Greek classes.

We also believe that the King James version of the Bible is an accurate, faithful, and reliable translation of these manuscripts and that the English reader can study and rely upon it with utmost confidence. Since its translation, it is apparent that God's blessing has been upon the

King James Version of the Bible in a way that God's blessing has not been upon any other English version of the Bible.

At the same time, we do not teach that the King James Version of the Bible was given by inspiration of God. To believe this would involve us in a number of unscriptural conclusions: 1) It would lead us to conclude that the italicized words constitute additional revelation; yet, we believe that revelation ceased with the completion of the New Testament. We do not believe that God breathed again in 1611. 2) It would lead us to conclude that the Apocryphal books were properly included in the King James Version of 1611. We do not believe that they should have been included in the 1611 edition of the King James Version, and we applaud their subsequent removal. 3) It would lead us to conclude that the way the King James Version was translated would be the only way it could have been translated. This in turn would lead us to conclude that the English translation of the Bible might be used to correct the Greek text. While we teach that the King James Version is accurately translated, we do not believe that it is necessarily the only way something might have been translated and still be accurate. Instead, we teach that it was accurately and correctly translated from the right set of manuscripts. 4) It would lead us to conclude that it would never be in need of revision. However minor the revisions have been, there have been a number of revisions of the King James Version of the Bible; and we are no longer using the 1611 edition. If the King James Version were given by inspiration of God as the New Testament manuscripts were, there should have been no need of revision, even minor spelling variations, because God would have gotten it right in the first place.

Then, can we say that the King James Version of the Bible is the inspired word of God? Yes, we can. While it was not given by inspiration of God, it is an accurate translation of what was given by inspiration of God. It is, therefore, the inspired word of God as a result of preservation.